REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the examination of the application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 15, and 17 – 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,130,757, hereinafter *Yoshida*, in combination with USP 6,741,367, hereinafter *Watanabe*. Claims 9 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshida*, in combination with *Watanabe*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,046, hereinafter *Nishikawa*.

In view of the rejections, the independent claims have been amended to more clearly define the differences between the present invention and the applied prior art.

The Examiner relies upon *Yoshida* for an alleged teaching of a data processing apparatus comprising one or more compression/decompression units that compress the data for the input job and decompress the compressed data.

The Examiner acknowledges that *Yoshida* does not expressly disclose a controller that, when a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) during processing of the data for a current job by said compression/decompression unit(s), obtains the processing wait period between pages of said current job, determines whether or not the data for said next job will undergo compression or decompression based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for said next-job data and said processing wait period, and controls the execution of processing of said next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) between pages of said current job in accordance

with this determination.   To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner relies on

Watanabe.

In particular, the Examiner alleges that *Watanabe* discloses a controller that,

when a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by said

compression/decompression unit(s) during processing of the data for a current job by

said compression/decompression unit(s), obtains the processing wait period

between pages of said current job, determines whether or not the data for said next

job will undergo compression or decompression based on a comparison between the

minimum processing time for said next-job data and said processing wait period, and

controls the execution of processing of said next job by said

compression/decompression unit(s) between pages of said current job in accordance

with this determination. To support this conclusion, the Examiner relies upon column

1, lines 23 - 26 and line 56 through column 2, line 19; column 12, line 32 through

column 13, line 8 and Figure 11 of *Watanabe.*

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis of *Watanabe.* Since the

Examiner's analysis focuses on the second embodiment of *Watanabe*, the following

remarks are primarily directed to that embodiment.

The Examiner alleges that *Watanane* Figure 11, steps S402 and S403,

disclose obtaining the processing wait period between pages of the current job.

However, *Watanane* Figure 11, steps S402 and S403, disclose obtaining a start time

t1, which represents the time when the paper conveyance started and obtaining the

present time t2. See column 12, lines 39 - 41. Accordingly, the Examiner's

description of *Watanane* Figure 11, steps S402 and S403 is incorrect.

The Examiner further alleges that *Watanabe* Figure 11, steps S401 - S409, and column 12, line 32 through column 13, line 8, discloses determining whether or not the data for said next job will undergo compression or decompression based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for said next-job data and said processing wait period. However, as explained at column 12, lines 39 - 64, *Watanabe* calculates a lapsed time period (t2 - t1) for the amount of time that the paper has been in conveyance. See the preceding paragraph. *Watanabe* then compares the calculated lapsed time to a calculated time difference (T1 - T2). T1 represents the amount of conveyance time it takes for the paper to reach the sensor, and T2 represents a maximum time period required for decompressing the print data for one block. See column 12, lines 50 - 55.

Therefore, all of the comparisons in *Watanabe* relate to the conveyance time for the paper to reach the sensor. It is an object of the second embodiment of *Watanabe* to complete print data decompression before the paper reaches the sensor. See column 11, lines 33 - 37. *Watanabe* is not concerned with maximizing use of the compressor/decompressor. In fact, at column 13, lines 32 - 34, *Watanabe* states that at certain times, the compressor/decompressor is resting.

In contrast to *Watanabe*, claim 1 compares the ***processing wait period*** between pages of said current job with the ***minimum processing time*** for said ***next job data***, wherein the processing wait period is the period of time between the processing of one page and the processing of a next page. And, if the processing wait period is longer than said minimum processing time, execution of processing of data for said ***next job*** by said compression/decompression unit(s) can be started. Therefore, claim 1 is concerned about starting processing of a next job between

pages of a current job. *Watanabe* is concerned with the starting of each page of a single job.

Accordingly, *Watanabe* does not overcome the admitted deficiency of *Yoshida*. *Nishikawa* also does not overcome the admitted deficiency of *Yoshida*. Therefore, claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the applied prior art.

Independent claims 4 and 11 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The remaining claims (including the newly added dependent claims) depend from claims 1, 4, or 11. Accordingly, all claims are patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above.

Applicants reserve the right to further challenge the Examiner's analysis of the individual references, and/or the motivation to combine the references in the manner proposed by the Examiner at a later time, if necessary and appropriate.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: __June 18, 2010__   By: __/WCRowland/_____
                                William C. Rowland
                                Registration No. 30888

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620

#1838492-v1